

Remarks

In the non-final Office Action mailed June 13, 2008 claims 1-20 are pending and claims 1-20 stand rejected. The Applicants have amended claims 1-20 and traverse the rejection herein.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious in view of U.S. Patent No.: 5,467,434 (Hower) in combination with U.S. Patent No.: 6,476,927 (Schwarz). The rejection of claims 1-20 will be discussed with regard to claim 1.

Amended independent claim 1, paraphrased herein, recites a method of operating a printing system. According to the method, a device independent set of desired printer options for a print source file is selected. The selected independent set of printer options are stored in a job ticket. A printer is selected to print the source file using the printer options stored on the job ticket. After the printer is selected, the printer options stored in the job ticket are compared to the capabilities of the selected printer. If the printer options stored in the job ticket match the capabilities of the selected printer, then the device independent printer options stored in the job ticket are converted to specific commands for the selected printer, and the converted commands and the print source file is sent to the selected printer. If the printer options stored in the job ticket do not match the capabilities of the selected printer, then an error is indicated to show that the device independent printer options are unavailable for the selected printer.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner refers to the rejection of claim 6, which recites an apparatus with analogous limitations of claim 1. In the rejection of claim 6, the Examiner asserts that Schwartz teaches a job ticket including device independent printer options. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Schwartz discloses allowing a user to select print options from a printer pool when invoking a printing process at a client computer (column 5, lines 1-9). After the user selects the print options from the printer pool, a print job ticket is sent to a server for processing. Based on the print job ticket, the server matches compatible printer devices from the printer pool (column 5, lines 62-67). The Applicants submit that Schwartz does not teach or reasonably suggest that the print options selected from the printer pool are an independent set of printer options.

In Schwartz, a user invokes the printing process by activating a print driver (column 6, lines 10-11). The user selects print options for the print job from a superset of all available

options from the available printers in the printer pool (column 6, lines 11-13). Schwartz is not operable to allow the user to select printer options which are not part of the printer pool. For example, if the user in Schwartz wished to select a staple option for the print job and no printer in the printer pool is capable of stapling, then this option would not be available. The Applicants therefore submit that the printer options in Schwartz are not device independent printer options as claimed in the pending application. The Examiner also has suggested that Hower does not teach device independent printer options stored in a job ticket. The Applicants agree, and therefore, submit that this limitation is non-obvious with respect to the cited art.

The Applicants further submit that Schwartz does not teach or reasonably suggest converting device independent printer options stored in the job ticket to printer specific commands. In Schwartz, after the user on a client computer selects print options for the print job, a job ticket is constructed from the user selected printer options. The user selected print options are based on the pool of printers (i.e., specific devices in the printer pool), and therefore, the job ticket does not contain independent printer options. The Applicants therefore submit that this limitation is neither taught nor reasonably suggested in Schwartz. The Examiner also has suggested that Hower does not teach converting device independent printer options stored in the job ticket to printer specific commands. The Applicants agree, and therefore, submit that this limitation is non-obvious with respect to the cited art. Independent claims 6 and 11, of which the Examiner rejected with similar arguments, are non-obvious for at least the same reasons provided above. Dependent claims 2-5, 7-10, and 12-20 are non-obvious for at least depending on non-obvious base claims 1, 6 and 11.

Conclusion

The Applicants submit that claims 1-20 are non-obvious in view of the cited art, and therefore, respectfully request the Examiner allow claims 1-20.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2008

/Sean J. Varley/

Sean J. Varley, Reg. No. 62,397
Duft, Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)